

FORMULAS IN THE CHRONICLE OF THE MOREA

MICHAEL J. JEFFREYS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Beck, <i>Volksliteratur</i>	H.-G. Beck, <i>Geschichte der Byzantinischen Volksliteratur</i> (Munich, 1971)
Duggan, "Couronnement"	J. J. Duggan, "Formulas in the <i>Couronnement de Louis</i> ," <i>Romania</i> , 87 (1966), 315-44
Lord, <i>Singer</i>	A. B. Lord, <i>The Singer of Tales</i> (Cambridge, Mass., 1960)
Magoun, "Oral-Formulaic Character"	F. P. Magoun, "Oral-Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry," <i>Speculum</i> , 28 (1953), 446-67
Parry, <i>L'Épithète</i>	M. Parry, <i>L'Épithète Traditionnelle dans Homère</i> (Paris, 1928)
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>

The detailed study on which this paper is based owes a good deal to the generous assistance of Professor Michael Levison, now of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. Professor Levison put at my disposal the facilities of the Computer Science Department of Birkbeck College, London. With my wife's help, I typed two long poems onto punched tape. From the tapes Professor Levison produced a concordance which has shortened the labor involved in the preparation of this study, and left me with a valuable tool for further research.

This paper began as part of a thesis completed under the kindly and stimulating care of Professor Robert Browning. It was written in the library of Dumbarton Oaks, where the Trustees for Harvard University had awarded me a Visiting Fellowship. My thanks are due to the librarians, who have helped me to find much non-Byzantine material.

IN discussions of early Demotic Greek poetry¹ throughout this century references have been made to *Stereotypversen* or *formulas*. When lines recur unchanged in two poems or more, the question has been raised whether they show literary influence of the one poem on the other, or whether they might in both cases be derived from the same source. This view has led to suggestions of an analogy with the Homeric poems.² In this case the repeated lines may be rhapsodic tags or oral formulas, which may prove that the poems in which they are found were sung by poets like the Homeric ἀοιδοί or their successors, the ῥαψωδοί. The source of the repeated lines would then be identified as a tradition of oral songs.

But the number of references proves to be no index of the amount of detailed work done. Most of the discussions are in general terms. Not all of the writers seem to have read, or understood, the Homeric studies available to them—or, more recently, parallel studies in other mediaeval European literary fields. Conclusions are often drawn on the flimsiest of evidence, and technical terms of Homeric criticism are sometimes inaccurately used.³ Most important of all, no serious attempt has been made to estimate the size of the problem. A. B. Lord has analyzed only twenty-four lines of *Digenis Akritas*, divided between samples of three different manuscripts, and has given repetition lists of thirteen individual phrases.⁴ D. C. Hesseling, in his introduction to the *Achilleis*,⁵ has listed about thirty phrases repeated from poem to poem. Lord finds his own results from two of the *Digenis* manuscripts “not so impressive as in *Beowulf* or in *Roland*,” though he is more hopeful about his seven-line sample of the Escorialensis. If these results are the best that can be reached, and if Hesseling’s thirty phrases are the only repeated “formulas,” then this subject is not worth examination. But I suggest that the published lists are merely the visible fraction of an iceberg of repeated material. They consist mainly of the

¹ This phrase will be used regularly to refer to the poems dealt with by Beck in *Volksliteratur*.

² For Homeric comparisons, see A. Heisenberg, “Ein angeblicher byzantinischer Roman,” in *Silvae Monacenses* (Festschrift zur 50-jährigen Gründungsfeier des philologisch-historischen Vereins an der Universität München) (Munich-Berlin, 1926), 30; D. C. Hesseling, “Le roman de *Belthandros et Chrysantza*,” *Neophilologus*, 23 (1938), 378; and particularly Lord, *Singer*, 207–20—the only serious attempt at formulaic analysis. Other references: e.g., G. Wartenberg, “Die byzantinische *Achilleis*,” in *Festschrift Johannes Vahlen* (Berlin, 1900), 193–201; Hesseling, *L’Achilléide Byzantine* (Amsterdam, 1919), 12–14; H. Schreiner, “Die Überlieferung des mittelhellenischen Romans von *Lybistros und Rhodamne*,” *BZ*, 34 (1934), 298–300; E. Kriaras, *Βυζαντινὰ Ἱπποτικά Μυθιστορήματα* (Athens, 1955), 205–6; G. Morgan, “Cretan Poetry: Sources and Inspiration,” *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 14 (1960), 44–68; K. Mitsakis, *Προβλήματα σχετικά με τὸ κείμενο, τὴς πηγὲς καὶ τὴ χρονολόγησιν τῆς Ἀχιλλίδας* (Thessalonica, 1963), 67–73; A. Pertusi, “La poesia epica bizantina e la sua formazione: problemi sul fondo storico e la struttura letteraria del *Digenis Akritas*,” in *La poesia epica e la sua formazione* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Anno CCCLXVII, Quad. 139) (Rome, 1970), 526–28—a criticism of the work of A. B. Lord cited *supra*; M. J. and E. M. Jeffreys, “*Imberios and Margarona*: the Manuscripts, Sources and Edition of a Byzantine Verse Romance,” *Byzantion*, 41 (1971), 122–60; Beck, *Volksliteratur*, 132.

³ E.g., Pertusi, *op. cit.*, 528, misunderstands the term “unperiodic enjambement.”

⁴ *Singer*, 207–20.

⁵ *L’Achilléide*, 12–14.

striking phrases which have compelled attention and comment. Beneath the surface is a very large number of less remarkable repetitions, so numerous as to demand further explanation. I hope in this study to make a practical definition of the formula, to put it into practice in one or two sample poems, and to draw preliminary conclusions. My aim is thus double: to establish a methodology for the study of formulas in mediaeval Greek and to test it in action.

Formulaic poetry has now been identified in many different languages and in many different periods of history. Most European vernaculars have produced such works in an early stage of their development. In recent years, this wide field has been examined with great care, with special concentration on Homer, Old English, and the French *chansons de geste*.⁶ But the conclusions of these studies have pointed in a number of different directions. The controversy has centered around the theories of Milman Parry. Parry began from the problem of the repeated phrases in Homer and worked out a logical structure of extreme subtlety and complexity to explain them. In his Paris theses of 1928⁷ he proved that they were traditional in origin, and, almost in passing, solved the problem of the Homeric language, by demonstrating that its confusion of dialects had also arisen for traditional reasons. His ideas were not new, but they were supported by a striking mixture of rigorous argument and statistical analysis, which gave them a logical precision unusual in literary studies. Soon he began to develop his conception of the genre of the traditional poem, in which he had placed Homer. He found clear parallels for features of Homeric style in a wide range of living oral literatures,⁸ and in the years before his accidental death in 1935 he made an extensive study of formulaic poetry among the oral singers of Yugoslavia, collecting a great deal of material from them.⁹ But the connection between Homer and modern oral poets remained loosely defined at his death. His work was continued by his collaborator in Yugoslavia, A. B. Lord, who prepared their field work for publication and has produced stimulating articles on details of the Yugoslav situation which could be relevant to Homer.¹⁰

Parry's ideas were slowly adopted by Homeric scholars. Their complexity and, still more, their comprehensive range made it impossible to accept them easily. By the end of the 1940's it was becoming difficult to write on any facet of the Homeric poems without mentioning their formulaic nature, but in the early 1950's a much more sudden and violent explosion of Parry's influence

⁶ For bibliographical material, see M. Curschmann, "Oral Poetry in Mediaeval English, French, and German Literature: Some Notes on Recent Research," *Speculum*, 42 (1967), 36-52; A. C. Watts, *The Lyre and the Harp: A Comparative Consideration of Oral Tradition in Homer and Old English Epic Poetry* (New Haven-London, 1969); *The Making of Homeric Verse. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry (Oxford, 1971), ix-lxii.

⁷ *L'Épithète; Les Formules et la métrique d'Homère* (Paris, 1928).

⁸ "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. II. The Homeric Language as the Language of an Oral Poetry," *HSCPh*, 43 (1932), 1-50.

⁹ See the account of A. B. Lord, "Homer, Parry, and Huso," *American Journal of Archaeology*, 52 (1948), 34-44, and the first published section of their material, *Serbo-croatian Heroic Songs*, I and II (Cambridge, Mass.-Belgrade, 1953-54).

¹⁰ These were conflated into Lord, *Singer*, which gives bibliographical references back to the articles.

occurred. Studies were written by specialists in more than one mediaeval literary tradition, using his theories in an effort to bring about revolutions in their separate fields.¹¹ Formulaic poetry was found everywhere among the early literatures in the vernacular languages of Europe. Wherever evidence could be found for the existence of such poetry, claims were made that it was composed by poets who resembled the *guslari* of Yugoslavia. The poets, it was said, were illiterate improvisers, working with traditional stories and traditional formulas. Their works needed to be judged by a special variety of literary criticism, which made most previous criticism obsolete. The criticism of their texts would be complicated because each manuscript was likely to prove a separate recording from the oral tradition, probably from a different singer. Such statements were made, and supported by elaborate studies, for many of the great epic poems of mediaeval Europe. Often the application of these ideas was illuminating and occasionally they contributed to the solution of long-standing difficulties. Sometimes they added little or nothing to the understanding of the poems concerned, and even raised insoluble problems.

These sweeping changes in scholarly attitudes naturally, at times, went too far. Two weaknesses in particular may be found in the methodology of this work. First, when transferring cultural observation from twentieth-century Yugoslavia to ancient and mediaeval literature insufficient care was taken to allow for sociological differences. Second, the definition of formula was allowed to become very loose, and the term, with its mass of accompanying theory, was sometimes applied to a given poem before rigorous proof had been made of its relevance. Fastening on these abuses, opponents of the theories have developed a good case for revision of the methods to be used and the conclusions to be drawn. Some, even more radical, have claimed that Parry's work has no validity at all. In most of the literatures in which the theories have been applied there are now representatives of all shades of opinion, ranging from orthodox believers in Parry's ideas through revisionists of various gradations to outright opponents. The bunching of scholars toward one end of the scale or the other varies considerably from language to language. This is not an easy moment at which to introduce Parry's work into a field where it has hardly so far been used.

In such a situation of contending thesis and antithesis, the validity of a methodology can be demonstrated convincingly only if it is based on a detailed survey of the question as it presents itself in several languages, but this cannot be attempted here. What follows, therefore, is a sketch of the dynamics of the present position, particularly concerning the two lines of weakness which have been found in the work of formula analysts. Thus, it may be possible to avoid the more obvious mistakes of the past, and to sug-

¹¹ The pioneers were Magoun, "Oral-Formulaic Character"; R. Lejeune, "Technique formulaire et chansons de geste," *Le Moyen Age*, 60 (1954), 311-34; J. Rychner, *La chanson de geste, essai sur l'art épique des jongleurs* (Geneva-Lille, 1955). Parry's theories have subsequently achieved a much wider extension: see e.g., N. Sen, "Comparative Studies in Oral Epic Poetry and the Vālmiki Rāmāyana: a Report on the Bālakānda," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 86 (1966), 397-409; K. Kailasapathy, *Tamil Heroic Poetry* (Oxford, 1968).

gest a line of approach close to that which will result from the current controversy. The resolution of the problems of the method, and of the conclusions to be drawn from it, can derive only from further formulaic study of the type which I will present here. There is no future in this case in suspending the practice until the theory is perfect.

The more significant of the weaknesses I have mentioned concerns the application of the Yugoslav analogy to written formulaic poetry of the past. Since the Yugoslav formulaic poets are illiterate, and follow traditional oral sources—the argument has held—the same must also be true of, say, the Anglo-Saxon formulaic poets.¹² But this conclusion is demonstrably not always true. Cynewulf, for example, uses in his work runic signatures which can be composed or appreciated only on the written page.¹³ The preface of Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, Riddle 35 of the *Exeter Book of Riddles*, and the Old English translation of the Psalms are all poems likely to have been composed in writing by men of some learning, and derived from written sources, which in the second two cases were in Latin. The *Phoenix* has a macaronic ending in mixed Anglo-Saxon and Latin. Yet all these poems are full of formulas: it is claimed, on evidence which, though not always conclusive, is certainly solid in parts, that their percentages of formulas are hardly distinguishable from those of the more heroic Anglo-Saxon poems.¹⁴

There are also theoretical reasons for rejecting the easy assumption that all formulaic poetry was composed by illiterate poets.¹⁵ In Yugoslavia today literacy certainly helps to prevent the constant changes of detail which are characteristic of a true oral poem in its successive re-creations. Learning to read and write introduces the concept of a fixed text. The literacy campaign of the Yugoslav government is destroying the creative oral tradition by distributing books and pamphlets at all literary levels in ever-increasing numbers, thereby initiating the newly literate into a new cultural world which covers most levels of his experience.¹⁶ If we turn the clock back to mediaeval Europe, East and West, we find that the new cultural world of the written word already existed, but it was largely a world of the learned, containing classical and ecclesiastical material in Latin or Attic Greek. Both subject and language usually separated the literary culture from the vernacular formulaic poem. Thus, it is impossible to make an easy analogy between the two situations, modern and mediaeval. If an Anglo-Saxon *scop* or French *jongleur* learned to read, most of the available reading matter would be in Latin. At the time of the creation of the great formulaic poems in those languages there can have

¹² Magoun, "Oral-Formulaic Character," 447, 460.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 460; R. E. Diamond, "The Diction of the Signed Poems of Cynewulf," *Philological Quarterly*, 38 (1959), 228–41.

¹⁴ L. D. Benson, "The Literary Character of Anglo-Saxon Formulaic Poetry," *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, 81 (1966), 334–41.

¹⁵ See G. S. Kirk, "Homer's *Iliad* and Ours," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 196 (1970), 48–59, which is the last shot in a campaign of some length, of which Kirk gives bibliographical details.

¹⁶ Lord, *Singer*, 136–38; *idem*, "Homer as Oral Poet," *HSCPh*, 72 (1967), 1–14.

been very little vernacular poetry to read. Such poets would have had far more chance of retaining their singing powers in the vernacular than would a Yugoslav villager, who may have been taught to read by a printed text of a poem in his own singing repertoire. My own feeling is that within the Yugoslav tradition printing has been a more destructive part of the cultural nexus than has literacy. Not only does printing increase prodigiously the variety of texts available, it also gives concrete support to the idea of a fixed text.

Most of the concepts which have spread widely in comparative formulaic studies derive from observation in Yugoslavia. But the idea of the traditional origin of the formula and its language is an exception. This was Parry's original discovery in the Homeric poems. The language of some of the Homeric formulas, with the cultural data they have preserved, proves that they are old and have been transmitted by a poetic tradition. Some of the formulas describe physical objects, for example, or practices in war, which were unknown at the time of composition of Homer, but which derive from the past, as Mycenaean archaeology has demonstrated.¹⁷ Others, especially the epithets for gods, seem to have preserved ancient cult titles.¹⁸ Further, the usefulness of the formulas to a tradition of poets is demonstrated by the lack of duplicate forms. Rarely is it possible to find two phrases for the same god or hero which can meet the same metrical and syntactical demands.¹⁹ This was a system devised to save thought in the combination of words, so that it would be possible to concentrate on the combination of phrases into episodes and of episodes into a poem. Once a useful phrase for these purposes was found, it was preserved from generation to generation. For Homer, we have the evidence of the Mycenaean elements which seem to have survived in the tradition for several centuries. The position in Yugoslavia is not quite the same. The Yugoslav oral poems contain many formulas; that, indeed, is what attracted Parry to examine them. But the phrases are much less striking, with very little archaism—so far as the non-expert may judge—and with little preservation in the formulas of material from the past. A. B. Lord has suggested a complex case for an economy of usage and an avoidance of duplicates in the works of individual poets.²⁰ This case seems not to be worked out in detail. But there are certainly no signs of a centuries-old selection process—the gradual accumulation of the right phrase for the right metrical and syntactical task, which we must postulate for Homer.

The evidence from French literature confirms the Yugoslav rather than the Homeric experience. A count of the formulas shared between the oldest *chansons de geste* has shown that they are few in number compared with those used in one poem only. This is evidence against the hypothesis of a tradition.²¹

¹⁷ See e.g., D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1959), 218-96.

¹⁸ See e.g., T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London, 1958), 127-30.

¹⁹ Parry, *L'Épithète*, 45-145.

²⁰ Singer, 50-54, and "The Role of Sound Patterns in Serbocroatian Epic," in *For Roman Jakobson* (The Hague, 1956), 301-5.

²¹ J. Wathelet-Willem, "A propos de la technique formulaire dans les plus anciennes chansons de geste," in *Mélanges Delboulle*, II (Gembloux, 1964), 705-27.

The preservation of cultural concepts seems equally poor in the French poems. It is possible to show that the battles of the *Chanson de Roland* are all fought by the latest tactics for the use of the spear, which had been introduced, probably by William of Normandy, shortly before the date when the poem was written down.²²

The appreciation of a formulaic poem, we are told, must always take into account the fact that it is orally produced and depends on the immediate effect of the section of the poem which is being performed at the time. The poem will give up all its secrets without being studied word by word, for the words are probably the result of the interplay of formulas. Adam Parry, however, has found verbal craftsmanship in Homer which appears at times to work on the level of the individual word, and at other times to combine formulas in such a way as to demand careful and thoughtful appreciation. The dialogue of the characters of the poems is skillfully varied according to their psychological makeup: great subtlety of wording and construction may be found in the *τειχοσκοπία* when Helen and Priam look down from the walls of Troy, and in several other famous Homeric scenes.²³

Difficulties in appreciation also arise on a larger scale. It must have taken more than a week for one man to perform the *Iliad*, and a good deal longer for the poem to be written down.²⁴ If it is a true oral production, dictated by an illiterate poet over this period, we should not expect structured control over the action. An episodic poem with each episode probably reflecting a day's work would be much more likely. Yet an amazing tightness of plot and construction is certainly to be found in Homer, and in some of the *chansons de geste*.²⁵ On both these levels, the small-scale verbal felicities and the large-scale organization, it is difficult to know how to make a critical reaction. Perhaps we should extend the range of oral poetics to include these features, and call them the marks of an excellent oral poem. On the other hand, we may have to use this argument to remove the poems concerned from the genre of oral poetry, as strictly defined. Though composed under the influence of an oral tradition, they may show in these other ways characteristics of composition by an author using writing.

Finally, formulaic poems are often preserved in several variant manuscript versions which it is difficult to reconcile into a single text. This fact reflects the experience of collectors of oral poems in many lands, for if the collector

²² D. J. A. Ross, "L'originalité de 'Turolodus': le maniement de la lance," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, Xe-XIIe siècles, 6 (1963), 127-38. But note that the physical background of Southern France is often maintained in songs sung in the North. See P. I. Aebischer, "Halt sunt li pui e li port tenebrus," *Studi Medievali*, 18 (1952), 1-22.

²³ A. Parry, "The Language of Achilles," *TAPA*, 87 (1956), 1-7; "Have we Homer's *Iliad*?", *Yale Classical Studies*, 20 (1966), 177-216; and "Language and Characterization in Homer," *HSCP*, 76 (1972), 1-22.

²⁴ The question is discussed in practical terms by A. B. Lord, "Homer and Hsuo I: the Singer's Rests in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song," *TAPA*, 67 (1936), 109-10, and J. A. Notopoulos, "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry," *HSCP*, 68 (1964), 1-12.

²⁵ See e.g., M. Delbouille, "Les chansons de geste et le livre," in *La technique littéraire des chansons de geste* (Actes du colloque de Liège [1957], Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. CL) (Paris, 1959), 339-48.

records the same song twice, he will find, if he is dealing with a live oral tradition, that the poem has changed a little. The process which he is examining is not word-for-word memorization, but the re-creation of the poem at each telling. In Yugoslavia Lord has studied the question in detail.²⁶ The conditions of story, thematic structure and formulaic language, as well as memory of the last telling, will be likely to make one version very like another. But there are always differences, until the re-creative tradition dies. Then the influence of fixed, probably written, texts converts the poets into verbatim reproducers without the potential for recomposition.

The similarities between this experience of oral singers in practice and the manuscripts of the formulaic poetry of the past are obvious. But several studies have shown that the parallels are frequently illusory.²⁷ The differences between the manuscripts are often only differences of expression within the line, which do not prevent line-by-line comparison between the texts, or even their printing on facing pages of a book. These are not the differences of a live oral tradition. But there are two other explanations for such a situation which would still account for the presence of formulas in the text. The poem may have been learned by heart in a purely reproductive rhapsodic tradition, and the variants may mark the inadequacies of two different memories. Probably more common, in my view, is a situation where a formulaic poem has been handed down by a purely scribal tradition, and the variants have been caused by the scribes. Recognizing the characteristics of a fluid oral poem in the text before them, they are not scrupulous about its accurate reproduction. They remake it as they copy, employing some of the formulaic techniques which they have learned in listening to oral songs.

The use of writing in a formulaic tradition is supported by the analysis of a French compilation including all the poems of the cycle of Garin de Monglane. This cycle of stories, closely connected with the Guillaume cycle, has been regarded as good evidence for the hypothesis of oral composition in the *chansons de geste* because it takes varied shapes and includes different numbers of its constituent parts in any one manuscript. But it has been shown with great clarity that one such manuscript was not made by recording the words of an oral poet. It was made in the scriptorium, by separating the gatherings of an earlier volume and inserting new material, which was linked to the old by a bridge passage copied from another manuscript.²⁸

In this way, all the analogies used in the comparative study of formulaic poetry have been invalidated, over at least some part of their field of action. But, though this fact devalues the effectiveness of Parry's critical tools, it does not destroy them. The formulaic analysis of poetry to which that process is relevant can no longer be regarded as the comprehensive solution to all the problems of several periods of literary history. Yet, the fact remains that nearly

²⁶ *Singer*, 99-123.

²⁷ E.g., Delbouille, *op. cit.*, 376-85; A. C. Baugh, "Improvisation in the Middle English Romance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 103 (1959), 418-54.

²⁸ M. Delbouille, "Dans un atelier de copistes," *CahCM*, 3 (1960), 14-22; and M. Tyssens, "Le style oral et les ateliers de copistes," in *Mélanges Delbouille*, II, 659-75.

every literature, inside and outside Europe, has been through a stage of formulaic composition. There must be a reason. It is inconceivable that the formulas arise from the unfettered choice of the authors of these poems, each of whom decided independently, over several millennia, that his artistic purposes were best served by formulaic expression. There must have been some external pressure operating on all the poets, a pressure which transcends linguistic, racial, geographical, and historical boundaries. It is a phenomenon which operates at a primitive stage of a language, when it is first put into writing, or at a moment when a new, more popular form of that language first achieves written expression. Its observable operation today is limited to primitive societies, illiterate or with many illiterate members, where popular poems are composed and sung in the formulaic style. In the face of this evidence, admittedly circumstantial but very strong, it is impossible to break the link between formula and oral composition, but the link must be made more subtle and responsive to the circumstances of the poems to which the theory is being applied.

All that is needed is a change in the mood of a verb. Instead of the imperative, one must use the subjunctive. Formulaic composition must not impose, but only suggest, conclusions. The scholar who proves that a poem is formulaic has discovered nothing concrete about the text he is analyzing. He has merely opened up a new dimension of critical study, and demonstrated that a new series of questions should be posed about the poem. Those questions are not a package deal, to be applied automatically and in full to any formulaic poem, then rejected out of hand if any detail proves inappropriate. When examining a formulaic poem, a scholar must be sensitive to the possibility that its poet was illiterate, his story and language traditional, the textual situation complicated by different dictated versions, and that literary judgment may need to be formed on unusual criteria. Examining the text and the objective historical facts surrounding it, he will obtain data under all or most of these headings. When he has considered these questions—which would probably not have been asked without the proof of the existence of formulas—he has the criteria for judgment on this poem. If the questions bring negative answers, the enquiry will soon come to a halt. But if one or more answers are clearly positive, then the Parry-Lord theories will recover much of their old incisiveness. In either case one important decision must still be reached: what was the precise position of the poet in regard to the oral tradition under the influence of which he must have been working?

The methods of formulaic analysis now tell us little about the poet who has produced the poem. The emphasis has been transferred to the tradition in which he composes. That tradition may have given him nothing but the habit of working in formulas. It may, on the contrary, give him the content of the formulas, a language appropriate to the oral meter, a traditional story, a system of poetics by which his poem must be judged, and a method of disseminating his text which will prevent an editor from publishing a unified version. All these features are suggested by the proof of formulaic composition,

and all stand ready to be examined in a poem for which that proof has been made. They will be the basis for the conclusions of this study.

The second of the two weaknesses which have been found in formulaic analysis will concern us in the first stages of the examination of early Demotic Greek to be reported here. Many criticisms have been made, in all the languages concerned, about the methodology used in deciding that a phrase is a formula. As we have seen, Milman Parry's first published work was a qualitative proof of the existence of formulas in Homer. The archaic language, useful metrical characteristics, and lack of duplicate forms in many noun-epithet phrases demonstrate that these form parts of a formulaic system of composition.²⁹ But two years later, when writing to rebut early criticisms of his work and to fit it for a wider audience, he plainly felt a need to add a quantitative dimension to the qualitative proof already established.³⁰ The point was driven home economically by printing the first twenty-five lines of each of the two Homeric epics, and underlining the formulas. "I have put a solid line beneath those word-groups which are found unchanged elsewhere in the poems, and a broken line under phrases which are of the same type as others. In this case I have limited the type to include only those in which not only the metre and the parts of speech are the same, but in which also at least one important word or group of words is identical, as in the first example: *μηνιν...Πηληιάδεω 'Αχιλῆος* and *μηνιν...ἑκατηβόλου 'Απόλλωνος*."³¹ In line 6 of *Iliad* I the phrase *ἐξ οὗ δῆ*, occurring—naturally, one might think—at the beginning of the line, is underlined solidly on the basis of one other occurrence of the three words at the same position. In stating his practice for the inclusion or omission of formulas, earlier in the same article, Parry had said, "Accordingly I have regarded as formulas, or possible formulas, only expressions made up of at least four words or five syllables, with the exception of noun-epithet phrases, which may be shorter."³² *ἐξ οὗ δῆ* seems to be a mistake, and it is not the only mistake. Thus, Parry's underlined samples are a quantitative illustration made in support of a qualitative proof of the formulaic nature of the Homeric poems. They do not seem to have been constructed with great care, and do not always follow Parry's own guidelines on formula length.

These slight inaccuracies would have had no importance had all formulaic traditions proved to be like the Homeric. Unfortunately, as formulaic study spread to other literatures, it was found that qualitative proof was impossible outside Homer, and that a quantitative argument was usually the only basis on which to build. The importance of formulas to the poet was now to be demonstrated only by statistical means, by showing how large a proportion of his verses contained repetitions. However, although the basis of proof was now very different from that which Parry had used for Homer, his methods were continued, with no less imprecision. The underlined samples, which he

²⁹ *L'Épithète*, 45-145.

³⁰ "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I. Homer and Homeric Style," *HSCP*, 41 (1930), 73-147.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 117.

³² *Ibid.*, 84 note 1.

had called "the easiest and best way of showing the place the formula holds in Homeric style," subsequently became the only detailed evidence required to *prove* the central position of the formula.³³ But there was no radical examination of the statistical significance of the length of the samples, or of the standards to be maintained in deciding whether to underline a phrase as a formula.

Two samples of twenty-five lines each had been chosen by Parry as a mere illustration, but this number of lines was later taken as the maximum number needed for full proof. Some samples were much shorter than this.³⁴ I would like to report from my own work on the distortions which may arise with short samples. In the two poems which I have analyzed it would be possible to maintain on the basis of one pair of fifteen-line samples that the first poem had no example of "straight formula," i.e., verbatim repetition of a complete half-line, while the second poem had 50 percent of such formulas.³⁵ If one used another pair of samples, one could claim that the first poem had 87 percent of "straight formula," on the basis of fifteen lines, while the second had none for as many as thirty-seven consecutive lines.³⁶ In such circumstances, the scope available for unconscious bias and simple bad luck is too great. I propose to include here a sample table of one hundred lines, but I would not base a case for the formulaic quality of a whole poem even on a sample of this size, especially as this is the first sustained study in this linguistic field. I have been fortunate enough to have access to computer techniques which have enabled me to analyze two poems in their entirety.

As well as "straight formula," which he underlined solidly in his tables, Parry included what have become known as "formulaic" repetitions, underlined with dotted lines as "phrases of the same type as others." This vaguely defined practice is interesting in that it shows the adaptability of the Homeric formulas to new situations, and the importance of analogy in creating new formulas on the basis of the old. It is a valuable tool for analyzing an established formulaic system, but, in my view, weak evidence in the first attempt to prove the existence of that system. Here it is the solid underlining which is convincing, the repetitions which fill a complete metrical division of the line with a phrase which is substantially identical with another. In attempting to find "formulaic" repetitions myself, I have had a constant sense that they

³³ "The formulaic character of the verse is demonstrated by Chart I" (Magoun, "Oral-Formulaic Character," 449); "It seems clear from the chart that the *Chanson* is formulaic beyond any question" (Lord, *Singer*, 202, referring to a sample of eleven lines); "Finally, any attempt to tie the *Cypria* to a literary mimesis of the *Iliad* is disproved by the fact that the key phrase . . . is a formula" (The phrase, well supported as a formula by evidence from Homer, is one half-line in a fragment of three lines from the *Cypria*: Notopoulos, *op. cit.*, 33).

³⁴ Some of the shortest samples are those chosen by Lord in *Singer*, 198–221. He is not here attempting complete proof, but offering suggestions to specialists in different fields. Even for this purpose, however, samples of ten, seven, and seven lines of *Digenis Akritas* in its different manuscripts are very short. Watts, *The Lyre and the Harp*, 126–97 (see note 6 *supra*), has detailed criticisms of the use of these charts in Old English studies.

³⁵ There are no examples of "straight formula" in *Chronicle of the Morea*, 5064–78, but there are fifteen half-lines of it out of thirty half-lines of text in *Alexander*, 1690–1704.

³⁶ There are twenty-six half-lines of "straight formula" out of thirty in *Chronicle*, 8803–17, but no examples at all in *Alexander*, 4325–61.

were too vulnerable to coincidence in the mind of the poet and to the subjective feelings of the researcher. In this study, therefore, the formula must fill either the first or the second half of the political line, the popular meter of early Demotic Greek poetry. It must be either eight or seven syllables long respectively.

As for the variations in wording permissible within these limits, it is impossible to set rigid standards.³⁷ The following may be freely allowed: differences of spelling which do not change the pronunciation; declension or conjugation of one or more elements in the phrase, provided that the length of the formula remains unchanged; substitution of one monosyllabic preposition or conjunction for another, or of one personal pronoun for another, or even the omission of such insignificant words if it can be done without change to the overall metrical shape, or if it enables another element in the phrase to expand into a grammatical form which would otherwise break the formula. But when the changes involve, for example, inversion of the order of words, or the substitution of one polysyllabic word for another, it is difficult to demonstrate that such changes are a regular part of the poet's formula variation. There are, of course, borderline cases. The researcher may be quite convinced of the formulaic status of such repetitions, but he must carry his readers with him. His results are likely to be published in the form of a percentage, and by including dubious formulas on the list, he may increase that percentage by an insignificant amount. But the sceptical reader is unlikely to rework the sums for himself. He is more likely to treat the whole study with an uneasy sense of disbelief. Thus, formulas about which there may be reasonable doubt will be presented here as a distinct additional category, and the reader may then accept or reject them without prejudice to the conclusions drawn from the more solid evidence.

The result will be expressed in the form, "This poem is 30 percent straight formula." It is obvious that the percentage will have no value in itself, but only within the framework of other similar studies. There is some evidence to suggest that comparisons of this sort may have a degree of validity even across language barriers, and so this study will look at some of the results obtained in other traditions. In the present state of knowledge, however, comparisons can carry conviction only if they are made between poems in the same language and meter, and of approximately the same date. Ideally, the comparative material should include such a poem which has not been influenced by the techniques of formulaic poetry. In this way the evidence of contrast may be added to that of similarity.

The poem chosen for study here is the *Chronicle of the Morea*, in the Copenhagen manuscript.³⁸ It has the advantage of great length—8930 lines complete enough to permit formula analysis. The manuscript may be dated to the 1380's,

³⁷ The fullest discussion is in J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford, 1968), 36–9. Hainsworth's conclusions are rather more complex than those given here, as he is dealing only with the complex metrical arrangements of Homer.

³⁸ Ed. J. Schmitt (London, 1904).

on a satisfactory agreement of watermark and internal evidence.³⁹ The date of composition is controversial, estimates ranging from soon after 1300 to the date of the manuscript. I would place it around 1320, and claim it as an original Greek work, not a translation from French, Italian, or Provençal, as has been suggested. The surviving versions in French, Italian, and Aragonese I believe to be derived, directly or indirectly, from the Greek. There exist four other Greek manuscripts, but these are of little use as independent witnesses to the text, except where the Copenhagen manuscript is lacunose. All are a century or more later in date.⁴⁰

Since this is the first sustained attempt at formula analysis in early Demotic Greek, it is necessary to include a second poem to give significance to the results. I have chosen the Byzantine *Alexander* poem.⁴¹ This is in the same fifteen-syllable meter as the *Chronicle*. It is shorter—6117 lines—but not so much shorter as to make comparisons difficult. The date of the subscription to its only manuscript is 1388, which would coincide perfectly with the date of the *Chronicle* manuscript: but, like the latter, it might have been composed earlier.⁴² It is not from the Demotic literary stratum, as it is a version of a classical original, in a language with learned pretensions, though it is not, in the last resort, a learned poem. Linguistic study shows long lists of divergences from the classical norms of grammar,⁴³ and in literary histories it is always included in the chapters devoted to popular poetry. Nevertheless, it is a purely literary work, written in his study by a man of some learning. There is no hint of formulas in its composition. The purpose of its inclusion here is to throw into relief the formulaic nature of the *Chronicle*.

These two poems were typed on to punched tape. Their words were formed by computer into a concordance. The key-word at each citation was printed in the center of the page, with the rest of its line arranged as context before and after it. In addition, the examples of each word in the concordance were arranged alphabetically by the initial letters of the words following the key-word. In this way, repeated phrases were thrown together into a narrow area of the concordance, from which it was possible to abstract them. All that remained to be collected by inspection were the repetitions involving differences, minor in grammar but major in spelling. The augment has been a major source of trouble here. The use of the computer has made the task both quicker and more accurate.

³⁹ See D. Jacoby, "Quelques considérations sur les versions de la *Chronique de Morée*," *Journal des Savants* (1968), 155.

⁴⁰ The most recent views expressed on this extremely complex problem are those of Jacoby, *op. cit.* The best introduction to previous work is G. Spadaro, "Studi introduttivi alla *Cronaca di Morea I*," *Siculorum Gymnasium*, 12 (1959), 125–52. See also H. E. Lurier, *Crusaders as Conquerors* (New York–London, 1964). The views expressed in the text are different from those of all these studies. I hope soon to have an opportunity to defend them. (A few preliminary points are made on pages 191–92 *infra*.)

⁴¹ Ed. S. Reichmann, *Das byzantinische Alexandergedicht* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1963).

⁴² K. Mitsakis, "Beobachtungen zum byzantinischen *Alexandergedicht*," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, 16 (1967), 119–26; but cf. the remarks of Beck, *Volksliteratur*, 133 note 2.

⁴³ A. Christensen, "Die Sprache des byzantinischen *Alexandergedichtes*," *BZ*, 7 (1898), 366–97.

From the concordance has been compiled a list of all the repetitions in the poems which come within my definition of the formula. Each half-line has been checked individually to see whether it might not be repeated in a slightly different form. The poems have been treated with equal care in the search for repeated phrases: even so, given the size and complexity of the task, a number of errors must have occurred. All that may be said by way of mitigation is that they are likely to be spread evenly through both poems, especially as these have been considered simultaneously, not consecutively. Once possible repetitions have been found, however, the two poems have not been treated with strict impartiality. The decision whether to include a given phrase in the list of repetitions is subjective. Its subjective nature may be reduced by careful definition, but can never fully be eliminated. Since the case which is being made here depends on the repetition percentage of the *Chronicle* proving to be much higher than that of the *Alexander*, I have taken care to establish a slight but detectable bias in the decisions, tending in the opposite direction. A number of similar phrases which would have been rejected as formulaic repetition for the *Chronicle* have been included for the *Alexander*. A complete listing of all the formulas and near-formulas in the two texts would occupy hundreds of pages; so I have attempted a compromise in the volume of evidence presented. Nevertheless, there is considerably more given here than in comparable studies.⁴⁴

In Tables I and II are listed all the formulas in the two poems which occur eight times or more. The number eight is an arbitrary figure, chosen because it seemed to produce a suitable total volume of material. The range of possible variation in the phrase is generally that which I have given in defining the formula. Some examples from the *Chronicle* have been omitted, where the evidence did not seem immediately convincing.

TABLE I

Alexander: repetitions with more than 8 examples.

16 examples: ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος (1st half of line): 1551, 1593, 2099, 3018, 3207, 3933, 4040, 4104, 4138, 4565, 5018, 5468, 5552, 5726, 5818, 6045.

10: μετὰ τῶν στρατευμάτων (2nd half of line): 1019, 1072, 1209, 1271, 1474, 1588, 2005, 2103, 3275, 3325.

10: σὺν πάσῃ τῇ δυνάμει (2): 1232, 1470, 1530, 1984, 2123, 2866, 4519; σὺν πάσῃ μου δυνάμει: 1841, 5020; σὺν πάσῃ σου . . . : 115.

⁴⁴ Among the best documented studies are those of Magoun, "Oral-Formulaic Character," 464-67, and, in a different way, Duggan, "Couronnement," 315-44. Watts, *The Lyre and the Harp* (see note 6 *supra*), 126-97, quotes the evidence of several earlier studies with critical comments.

TABLE II

Chronicle of the Morea: repetitions with more than 8 examples.

62 examples: ὁ πρίγκιπα Γυλιάμος (2): 2890, 2956, 3030, 3192, 3285, 3331, 3426, 4367, 4374, 4550, 5478, 5745, 6721, 6744, 6922, 6957, 7008, 7036, 7113, 7819, 8062; ὁ πρίγκιπας . . . : 2824, 2966, 3142, 3188, 5846; τὸν πρίγκιπα Γυλιάμον: 2962, 3082, 4097, 4202, 4562, 5036, 5796, 5837, 5868, 6391; . . . Γουλιάμον: 5873; στὸν πρίγκιπα Γυλιάμον: 3024, 3482, 5211, 6242, 6385, 6449, 6871; . . . Γουλιάμον: 3121; τοῦ πρίγκιπα Γυλιάμου: 1193, 2845, 2936, 3033, 4797, 6407, 6771, 7304, 8061, 8478; . . . Γυλιάμο: 3388, 3410; τοῦ πρίγκιπος Γυλιάμου: 3117, 3399, 6574, 7105, 8595.

44: ὁ ἀφέντης τῆς Καρύταινας (1): 3227, 3284, 3288, 3832, 3883, 4011, 4041, 4059, 4068, 4213, 4360, 4371, 4385, 4418, 4495, 5654, 5747, 5762, 5775, 5879, 5896, 5918, 6616, 6626, 6641, 6728, 7208, 7215, 8117, 8151; ἀφέντης τῆς . . . : 3156; τὸν ἀφέντην . . . : 4108, 5741, 6633, 6693, 6735; ἀφέντην . . . : 1923; τὸν ἀφέντη . . . : 4344; ἀφέντη . . . : 5803; τοῦ ἀφέντη . . . : 3362, 8005, 8121, 8127; τοῦ ἀφέντου . . . : 4477.

28: μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι (2): 906, 980, 1012, 1497, 2101, 2466, 2975, 2979, 3543, 4432, 5254, 5678, 5869, 6177, 6211, 7221, 7856, 7869, 8623; μικροὺς τε καὶ μεγάλους: 2018, 2311, 2407, 2895, 3720, 4333, 6169; μικρῶν τε καὶ μεγάλων: 8632, 8661.

27: μὲ τὰ φουσσαῖτα ὅπου εἶχεν (2): 1513, 3299, 4193, 4622, 4688, 4887, 4894, 5054, 5095, 6617, 6622, 6658, 6786, 6873, 8807, 9147, 9173; . . . εἶχαν: 3548, 4686, 9188; . . . ἔχουν: 2567; . . . ἔχει: 5039, 5360; . . . εἶχες: 5507; . . . εἶχε: 8366; . . . ἔχω: 8397; . . . ἔχεις: 9072.

23: ἐκεῖνος ὁ Γυλιάμος (2): 1308, 3467, 3622, 4542, 6370, 7753, 7967, 7987, 7991, 8488; ἐκεῖνον τὸν Γυλιάμον: 1317, 3175, 3471, 3616, 5929, 6382, 6521; . . . Γυλιάμο: 2728, 2757; ἐκείνου τοῦ Γυλιάμου: 3044, 3141, 6245, 7943.

21: ὁ ἀφέντης τῆς Καρυταίνου (2): 3219, 3856, 4018, 4075, 4453, 5854, 5912, 6637, 8168; κι ὁ . . . : 4409; τὸν ἀφέντην . . . : 3350, 3878, 6886, 7187; ἀφέντη . . . : 4063; τὸν ἀφέντη . . . : 4103; τοῦ ἀφέντου . . . : 3251, 3847, 4327; τοῦ ἀφέντη . . . : 8115, 8132.

19: ὅλον τὸ πριγκιπᾶτο (2): 6612; κι ὅλον . . . : 8285, 8586; κι ὅλον τὸ πριγκιπᾶτον: 5369; ὅλου τοῦ πριγκιπάτου: 2633, 4406, 6738, 6756, 6758, 7311, 7439, 7507, 7681, 7767, 7992, 8140, 8159, 8628, 8845.

18: ἐκεῖνος ὁ Ρομπέρτος (2): 2274, 2568, 7511; . . . Ρομπέρτος: 2235, 2366, 2388, 2435; ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ρομπέρτον: 1183, 1222, 2194, 2215, 2336; . . . Ρομπέρτον: 2182; ἐκείνου τοῦ Ρομπέρτου: 1195, 6318; . . . Ρομπέρτου: 2313, 2398, 2489.

18: οὕτως τὸν ὠνομάζαν (2): 336, 1052, 1555, 1913, 1923, 1930, 2947, 3049, 3177, 3540, 4558, 5420, 5753, 6340; οὕτως τὴν . . . : 7749, 7983, 8823; οὕτως τοὺς . . . : 795.

17: καὶ λέγει πρὸς ἐκεῖνον (2): 1582, 1868, 2412, 3406, 3863, 6923, 7012; . . . ἐκείνην: 296; . . . ἐκείνους: 1612, 1813, 3913, 6735, 9080; καὶ λέγουν πρὸς ἐκείνους: 2378; . . . πρὸς ἐκεῖνον: 4981, 5319, 9069.

17: μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲς ἐκεῖνος (2): 232, 1652, 1707, 1756, 1766, 1786, 1831, 1903, 2098, 2353, 2428, 2626, 3189, 8142; μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲ ἐκεῖνον: 338, 1922; μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲν ἐκεῖνον: 2422.

17: ὡς φρόνιμος ὅπου ἦτον (2): 188, 412, 779, 998, 1576, 1611, 1887, 2444, 2773, 4914, 5666, 6551, 6570, 8778; ὡς φρόνιμη . . . : 7368; ὡς φρόνιμος ὅπου εἶσαι: 6953; ὡς φρόνιμοι ὅπου εἶστε: 8540.

17: ὁ κόντος τῆς Τσαμπάνιας (2): 152, 1799, 2160, 2352, 2421; τὸν κόντον . . . : 133, 140; στὸν κόντον . . . : 175; τοῦ κόντου . . . : 165, 185, 2130, 2251, 2308, 2318, 2324, 2376, 2425.

15: ὅλα του τὰ φουσσᾶτα (2): 1090, 2968, 3608, 3625, 5467, 6724, 6810, 7109, 8326; κι ὅλα . . . : 1158, 9008; ὅλα σου . . . : 4957; ὅλου του τοῦ φουσσάτου: 5152, 5586, 5640.

15: οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ φουσσάτου (2): 904, 1895, 3659, 3829, 3868, 4924, 4975, 9011, 9044; τοὺς πρῶτους . . . : 1811, 1837, 3819, 3959, 6634; τὸν πρῶτον . . . : 9056.

14: τὴν Κωνσταντίνου πόλιν (2): 445, 840, 3077; στὴν . . . : 1166, 7313, 8762; τῆς Κωνσταντίνου πόλης: 891, 1203, 1508, 2473, 5792, 5798, 6274, 7305.

14: ἡ ντάμα Μαργαρίτα (2): 7346, 7358, 7624, 7635, 7674; τὴν . . . : 7388, 7424, 7700; τὴν ντάμα Μαργαρίταν: 8456; τῆς ντάμα Μαργαρίτας: 7529, 7555, 7668, 7691, 7728.

13: ἐκεῖ στὴν Ἀνδραβίδα (2): 1432, 1452, 3517, 4962, 5044, 5094, 5132, 5209; ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν . . . : 1641, 5855, 7420, 8849; ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Ἀνδραβίδαν: 7790.

12: ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν (2): 1111, 1159, 1478, 5468, 6440, 8895; κ' . . . : 6865; ἐκεῖνες τὲς ἡμέρες: 3178, 8112, 8479, 8676; κ' . . . : 8856.

12: ἐπληροφόρεσέ τους (2): 881; κ' ἐπληροφόρεσέ τον: 189, 2268, 6902, 7825, 8354; κ' ἐπληροφόρεσάν τον: 1581, 2083, 2307, 4536; . . . το: 897; . . . τους: 2043.

12: τὸ κάστρον τῆς Μονοβασίας (1): 2644, 2765, 2781, 2957, 2967, 3143, 4330, 4376, 4425, 4460; στὸ κάστρον . . . : 2897; τοῦ κάστρου . . . : 2945.

12: μετὰ τὸν βασιλέα (2): 585, 589, 1162, 2575, 2599, 2624, 4593, 6654; . . . βασιλέαν: 5216, 5489, 5650, 5811.

12: τὸ Φράγκικον φουσσᾶτο (2): 5454; τὰ Φράγκικα φουσσᾶτα: 1530, 2914, 8371, 9159; τοῦ Φράγκικου φουσσάτου: 581, 639, 701, 754, 843, 1013, 4814.

12: ἐκεῖνος ὁ δεσπότης (2): 1103, 3496, 3942, 8860; κ' . . . : 3524; ἐκεῖνον τὸν δεσπότην: 3100, 3802; ἐκεῖνου τοῦ δεσπότη: 1086, 1102; . . . τοῦ δεσπότη: 8064, 8830; κ' . . . : 3474.

12: ὁ Μέγας ὁ Δεμέστικος (1): 4880, 4887, 4971, 5001, 5013, 5040, 5095, 5187, 5291; κι ὁ . . . : 4639, 5101; τὸν Μέγαν τὸν Δεμέστικον: 5431.

12: τί νὰ σὲ λέγω τὰ πολλά: 203, 482, 548, 753, 845, 1092, 1734, 2524, 2923; τί νὰ σᾶς λέγω . . . : 4055, 4842, 8569.

11: τες συμφωνίες ἐκεῖνες (2): 371, 571, 1893, 1896, 2853, 4334, 8591; στες ...: 8487; οἱ συμφωνίες ...: 580; τῆς συμφωνίας ἐκείνης: 2420; στὰς συμφωνίας ἐκείνας: 6400.

11: ἐκεῖνος ὁ μαρκέσης (2): 251, 291, 320, 378, 403, 7915; κ' ...: 3295; ἐκείνον τὸν μαρκέσην: 381, 1016; σ' ...: 678; ἐκείνου τοῦ μαρκέση: 1096.

11: ὡς τὸ ἐπληροφορέθη (2): 2176, 2679; κι ...: 1088, 1176, 3486, 5150, 6265, 6428, 6896, 8782; ὡς τὸ ἐπληροφορέθη: 8412.

11: ἐτότε ὁ δεσπότης (2): 3111, 3128, 3489, 3925, 8879, 8888, 9028, 9110; ... τοῦ δεσπότη: 8904, 8907, 9105.

11: πεῖλοι καὶ καβαλλάρτοι (2): 633, 644, 1717, 1725, 1730, 3514, 6573, 6727, 7154, 9197; πεῖλους καὶ καβαλλάρτου: 6802.

11: τὸν τόπον τοῦ Μορέως (2): 2342, 2677, 2712, 4277, 6313, 8534; στὸν τόπον ...: 8443, 8837; τοῦ τόπου ...: 1449, 2104, 6506.

10: ἐκεῖνα τὰ φουσσᾶτα (2): 2069, 2902, 3604, 3690, 4682, 6656, 9092; ἐκείνου τοῦ φουσσάτου: 4706, 6840; ἐκείνων τῶν φουσσάτων: 2904.

10: ἐκεῖνος τοῦ Μορέως (2): 2573, 4271, 8982, 8993, 9144; ἐκείνου τοῦ Μορέως: 3419, 7391, 8914; ἐκείνον τοῦ Μορέως: 6524, 8766.

10: ἐπληροφόρησάν τους (2): 637; κ' ...: 748, 1634, 3679, 9143; κ' ἐπληροφόρησάν τον: 4541, 8992; ἐπληροφόρησέ τον: 5845; κ' ...: 4373, 5773.

10: ὅπου ἦσαν μετ' ἐκείνον (2): 2323, 4030, 4219, 4345, 4818, 5156, 6384, 6917; κι ...: 5964; ... ἐκείνους: 2029.

10: ὡσὰν σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι (2): 537, 550, 630, 832, 2237, 2348, 2980, 5584, 6149; κι ...: 4581.

10: οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς βουλῆς του (2): 1671, 1751, 2075, 2631, 6293, 7828; τοὺς πρῶτους ...: 2571, 8817, 8997; τὸν πρῶτον τῆς βουλῆς τους: 313.

10: ὅλης τῆς Ρωμανίας (2): 591, 841, 979, 1037, 2606, 3059, 3107, 3697; κι ...: 1020, 1027.

9: ὁ πόλεμος ἐκεῖνος (2): 4803, 7094; τὸν πόλεμον ἐκείνον: 3300, 4921; στὸν ...: 3280, 4787, 4925, 7032, 7182.

9: χαρὰν μεγάλην ἔποικεν (1): 2141, 4372, 5239, 7741; ... ἔποικαν: 257, 1520, 3368, 3492, 7173.

9: ἀφέντης τοῦ Μορέως (2): 1192; ἀφέντη ...: 7425; ἀφέντην ...: 2437; ὁ ἀφέντης ...: 2483, 2541, 2577, 2592; τὸν ἀφέντην ...: 2220; τοῦ ἀφέντη ...: 8712.

9: ὁ ρῆγας τῆς Φραγκίας (2): 272, 3433; κι ...: 1313; τὸν ρῆγαν ...: 245, 6075; στὸν ρῆγαν ...: 2138; τοῦ ρηγὸς ...: 5925, 5940, 5953.

9: Δεμέστικός ὁ Μέγας (2): 4644, 4696, 4781, 4805, 5020, 5264, 5513; Δεμέστικον τὸν Μέγαν: 5482, 5581.

9: καὶ λέγει πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπα (1): 4303, 5514, 5883, 6767, 7425, 7484, 8913; ... πρίγκιπαν: 4221; καὶ λέγειν πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπα: 5262.

9: ὁ πρίγκιπας ὡς φρόνιμος (1): 4130, 5559; κι ...: 2964, 3299, 5229, 5474, 5701, 6584, 9210.

8: εἰς τὴν Μονοβασίαν (2): 2905, 2924, 2974, 4580, 4584, 4645, 5851; κ' ...: 2065.

8: ὁ δοῦκας γὰρ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν (1): 4409, 7275, 7970, 7985, 7991; κι ...: 7384; τοῦ δοῦκα γὰρ ...: 8003; τὸν δοῦκαν γὰρ ...: 8088.

8: πρὸς τὴν οὐσίαν ὅπου εἶχεν (2): 1645, 2553, 4279, 5580; ... εἶχαν: 2913, 2965; ... ἔχει: 1834; ... εἶχε: 6299.

8: ἄρχοντες φίλοι κι ἀδελφοί (1): 345, 576, 709, 999, 1613, 1814, 5359, 8513.

8: ἐκεῖνος ὁ μισὶρ Ντζεφρές (1): 2350, 8165, 8356; κ' ...: 2592; ἐκείνον τὸν μισὶρ Ντζεφρέ: 215, 313, 1812; ἐκείνου τοῦ μισὶρ Ντζεφρέ: 8390.

8: βουλὴν ἀπήραν ἐνομοῦ (1): 205, 702, 906, 2935, 3198, 3638, 5688, 5693.

8: μαντατοφόρους ἔστειλε (1): 4597; ... ἔστειλεν: 2778, 2890, 3121, 4540, 8352; ... ἔστειλαν: 3024, 9026.

8: κι ἀφότου ἐπαράλαβεν (1): 1239, 1791, 2875, 2956, 6350, 8653; ... ἐπαράλαβε: 2763; ... ἐπαράλαβαν: 2860.

8: κι ὁ ρῆγας ὡς τὸ ἤκουσε (1): 6830; ... ἤκουσεν: 478, 3462, 6498, 6896, 7138, 7827, 8136.

8: οὐδὲν ἠθέλησε ποσῶς (1): 1898, 2569, 6004, 6179, 7389; οὐδὲν ἠθέλησεν ποσῶς: 7614; κι οὐδὲν ἠθέλησεν ...: 2650; κι οὐδὲν ἠθέλησαν ...: 2035.

8: καθὼς σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι (2): 113, 401, 1077, 1085, 3509, 5950, 6337, 6565.

8: ὁ δοῦκας γὰρ τῆς Βενετίας (1): 335, 412, 433, 517, 1168, 1179, 2176; τὸν δοῦκαν γὰρ ...: 931.

8: κράζει τοὺς κεφαλᾶδες του (1): 2443, 2571, 2627, 3959, 6680, 8809, 8997; κράζουν τοὺς κεφαλᾶδες τους: 3819.

8: τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης (2): 848, 1292, 2843, 2866, 2973, 3079, 4229, 8808.

8: Φράγκοι τε καὶ Ρωμαῖοι (2): 724, 790, 4186, 8705, 8781, 8985; Φράγκους τε καὶ Ρωμαίους: 3960; Φράγκων τε καὶ Ρωμαίων: 2099.

8: ὁ πρίγκιπας Μορέως (2): 7158, 7496, 7947; κι ...: 8876; τοῦ πρίγκιπα ...: 6398, 6620, 7140; τοῦ πρίγκιπος ...: 6363.

8: τοῦ τόπου τὰ συνήθεια (2): 7334, 7504, 7568, 7589, 7639, 7880; στοῦ τόπου ...: 7923, 8640.

There is a great disparity here, both in the number of phrases and in the number of repetitions of each phrase. How fair is it to make a straight comparison between the two poems? First it must be remembered that the *Chronicle* is a little less than a half as long again as the *Alexander*. One would expect a larger number of repetitions in the longer poem, but there is a smaller factor working in the reverse direction. The *Alexander*, as a biography, is more unified in theme than the *Chronicle*. The name Ἀλέξανδρος in its various cases appears 630 times, while Ντιεφρές, the most frequent personal name in the *Chronicle*, is found no more than 125 times. The unity of subject in *Alexander* and the dominance of one name would lead one to expect more repeated phrases, especially those including the name "Alexander," if repetition were somehow a function of the language, meter, and date which the two poems share. This fact must compensate somewhat for the extra length of the *Chronicle*. Even so, it is no surprise that Table II is larger than Table I. What is striking is the scale of the difference; a strong contrast which no external factors can explain.

Further comparative material may best be found in Homer. It is not easy to make an equivalent list to Tables I and II, in spite of the existence of Schmidt's *Parallel-Homer*.⁴⁵ The combination of precision and flexibility in the hexameter complicates the establishment of a lower limit for formula length, and allows the same phrase to perform more than one metrical task in the line. In some cases, therefore, it is difficult to claim all repetitions of a short phrase as examples of the same formula. I have compiled the following list of cases where the formulaic status of the phrases is certain, but make no claim for its completeness.

91: τὸν (τὴν, τοὺς) δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη.

81: πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς.

78: πατρίδα γαῖαν.

62: τὸν (τὴν) δ' ἡμίβρετ' ἐπέϊτα.

60: δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.

51: θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη.

These, the best I can find in Homer, are a little more numerous than the most frequent examples in the *Chronicle*. Once more the validity of the comparison must be tested. Again there are two factors working in opposite directions. First, the two Homeric poems make up a corpus nearly three times as long as the *Chronicle*; so the Homeric statistics are inflated. Second, the complexity of the Homeric hexameter causes a fragmentation of the formulas referring to one person. Because of the number of different metrical shapes which may have to be filled, we find several different formulas, for example, for Odysseus. As well as πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (81 times) and δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (60) in the list above, there are πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (38), Ὀδυσσῆος θεῖοιο (27), Λαερ-

⁴⁵ C. E. Schmidt, *Parallel-Homer* (Göttingen, 1885, repr. 1965).

τιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος (12), διογενὴς Ὀδυσσεύς (4), πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς (4), ἐσθλὸς Ὀδυσσεύς (3), each of which is slightly different in its metrical or syntactical properties. This does not exhaust the list. By contrast, the political line of the *Chronicle* demands only two metrical shapes. Ντλεφρές gives rise to ἐκεῖνος ὁ μισὶρ Ντλεφρές and μισὶρ Ντλεφρές ἐκεῖνος, the first admirably suited to the first half of the line, and the second to the second half. There are no other formulas restricted to the idea Ντλεφρές. Others introduce a verbal or adverbial force which remains part of the essential idea of the formula. Thus, the wide range of metrical shapes demanded for Homeric formulas will tend to compensate for the greater length of the Homeric corpus, by reducing the frequency of individual formulas on the list. I would claim approximate parity of formula numbers in the most frequent phrases found in Homer and the *Chronicle*, when allowances have been made for the two factors I have described.

From lists of formula numbers I wish to proceed to an underlined sample. I have already explained the origin of this method of presenting results, and my misgivings over its use. From Table V, which gives an unusual position of omniscience, it is possible to see the reasons for the choice of lines 1701–1800. This is one of the three or four passages of 100 lines closest to the average figures quoted at the end of the table. Of these passages, it is the smoothest narrative, not interrupted by lacunas or textual problems. It will clothe with some flesh the statistical bones of Table V.

The following are the conventions in the footnotes of the Table:

- "= 200α": the half-line in question is identical in all respects to the first half of line 200.
- "= 300β," with quotation: this half-line differs from the second half of line 300 so slightly that I believe it would be generally accepted as within the definition of formulaic repetition. This may be checked, here and in the following categories, by comparing the half-line in the text with the evidence quoted.
- "= (400α," with quotation): this half-line is a little different from the first half of 400. I am convinced that the phrase should have formulaic status, but I realize that others may disagree.

Half-lines supported by evidence of these kinds will be underlined in the sample. Those in the third of these categories will, in addition, be placed in brackets in the text as in the notes. This is not a case of the dotted underlining returning in a different form. All the categories above would be given solid underlining in any formulaic studies I have seen. I have merely separated out the questionable part of that material, so that the reader may include it or omit it, according to his judgment of its validity.

- "cf. 500β," with quotation: this half-line has considerable similarity to the second half of line 500, so that the possibility of formula status was raised, but settled in the negative as not proven. These phrases will not be marked in the text.

- Ἦσαν χιλιάδες τέσσαρες, πεζοὶ καὶ καβαλλάριοι. 1725
 (Οἱ Φράγκοι [γὰρ] ὥς τὸ ἐμάθασιν) πάλε ἀπὸ τοὺς Ρωμαίους,
ὅπου ἦσασιν γὰρ μετ'αὐτοὺς κ'ἐξεύρασιν τοὺς τόπους,
ἐκεῖ τοὺς ἐπαρέσυραν, ἦλθαν καὶ ἠΰρανέ τους
καὶ πόλεμον ἐδώκασιν οἱ Φράγκοι κ'οἱ Ρωμαῖοι.
 Κ'οἱ Φράγκοι γὰρ οὐκ ἦσασιν, πεζοὶ καὶ καβαλλάριοι, 1730
μόνοι ἐφτακόσιοι μοναχοί, τόσους τοὺς ἐγνωμιάσαν.
Μὲ προθυμίαν ἀρχάσασιν τὸν πόλεμο οἱ Ρωμαῖοι,
διατὶ ὀλίγους τοὺς ἐβλεπαν, ὕστερα ἐμετενοήσαν.
Τί νὰ σέ λέγω τὰ πολλὰ καὶ τί τὸ διάφορόν μου;
τὸν πόλεμον ἐκέρδισαν ἐτότε ἐκεῖν'οἱ Φράγκοι· 1735
ὅλους ἐκατασφάξασιν, ὀλίγοι τοὺς ἐφύγαν.
Αὐτὸν [καὶ] μόνον τὸν πόλεμον ἐποίησαν οἱ Ρωμαῖοι
εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ποῦ ἐκέρδισαν οἱ Φράγκοι τὸν Μορέαν.
 (Κι ἀφότου ἐκερδίσασιν) τὴν Καλομμάτα οἱ Φράγκοι
κ'εἶδαν τὸν τόπον ἔμνοστον, ἀπλήν, χαριτωμένον, 1740
τοὺς κάμπους γὰρ καὶ τὰ νερά, τὸ πλῆθος τῶν λιβαδίων.
Ὁ Καμπανέσης ὥρισεν ὁλῶν τῶν πλευτικῶν του
ὁ κατὰ εἰς νὰ ἀπέρχεται ἐκεῖθεν, ὅπου ἦτον·
διὸ τὸν ἐπληροφόρεσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες οἱ Ρωμαῖοι,
ὅτι οὐδὲν τοῦ ἐκάμασιν τίποτε χρεῖα ἀπάρτι. 1745
Ὁρίσεν γὰρ κ'ἐβγάλασιν ἀπ'ἔσω ἐκ τὰ καράβια
σωτάρχιον, ἄρματα πολλὰ, ὁμοίως καὶ τζαγρατόρους.
Κι'ὅσον ἐπαραδιάβασεν τὰ μέρη Καλομμάτας
κι ἀνάπαψεν τὰ ἄλογα, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν λαόν του,
βουλὴν ἀπῆρεν ποῦ νὰ ὑπάη, ποῦ νὰ καβαλλικέψη. 1750

1725β See 1717β.

1726α = (οἱ Φράγκοι γὰρ ὥς ἔμαθαν 560α).

1727α = ὅπου ἦσασιν γὰρ μετ'αὐτόν 1299α.

1727β cf. ὅπου ἐξεύραν τοὺς τόπους 2023β; ὅπου ἐξεύραν τὸν τόπον 6685β.

1729α = καὶ πόλεμον ἃς δώσωμεν 839α.

1729β cf. 8 examples of Φράγκοι τε καὶ Ρωμαῖοι etc. (Table II, p. 181).

1730β See 1717β.

1731α = μόνοι τριακόσιοι μοναχοί 4897α.

1731β = 2150β, 8793β.

1733β = 3501β; = ὕστερο ἐμετανόησαν 3249β.

1734α = 11 other examples (Table II, p. 179).

1735α = 5505α; = τὸν πόλεμο ἐκερδίσεν 3269β; τὸν πόλεμο ἐκερδίσαν 4919β;
 = (μὲ πόλεμον ἐκέρδισεν 3261α).

1736α = ὅλα τὰ ἐκατασφάξασιν 4057α.

1738β = 2673β.

1739α = (ἀφότου γὰρ ἐκέρδισεν 2824α, 3077α, 3142α, 3285α, 6777α).

1742α = 1491α, 1778α.

1742β cf. καὶ εἰς [ὅλα] τὰ πλευτικά τους 651β.

1746β = 1408β.

1748β = στὰ μέρη Καλομμάτας 1954β.

1749β = 5923β; = (ὁμοίως κ'ἐκ τὸν λαόν μας 6108β).

1750β = ποῦ νὰ καβαλλικέψουν 5588β.

- Εἰς τοῦτο εἶπαν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς βουλῆς του,
 νὰ ἀπέλθουν στὴν Βελίγοστην κι ἀπέκει εἰς τὸ Νίκλι,
 διατὸ εἶναι χῶρες προεστῆς εἰς ὅλον τὸν Μορέαν·
 στὸν κάμπον κοίτονται κ'οἱ δύο, εὐθέως τὲς θέλουν πάρει·
 κι ἀπαύτου πάλε ν'ἀπελθοῦν στὴν Λακκοδαιμονίαν. 1755
- Καὶ τότε ὁ πρωτοστράτορας, μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲς ἐκεῖνος,
 εἶπεν καὶ ἐσυμβούλεψεν στὴν Ἀρκαδία νὰ ἀπέλθουν,
 τὸ κάστρον γὰρ νὰ ἐπάρουσιν, ὁ τόπος νὰ πλαταίνῃ,
 νὰ στείλουν κ'εἰς τὸ Ἀράκλοβον ὅπου κρατεῖ τὸν δρόγγον,
 ὅπου τὸ λέγουν τὰ Σκορτά, μικρὸν καστέλιν ἔνι, 1760
 ἀλλὰ εἰς τραχῶνιν κάθεται, πολλὰ ἔνι ἀφιρωμένον·
 λέγουν ὀκάπιοις τὸ κρατεῖ ἀπὸ τοὺς Βουτζαρᾶδες,
 Δοξαπατρήν τὸν λέγουσιν, μέγας στρατιώτης ἔνι·
 “κι ἀφῶν ἐπάρωμεν κι αὐτὸ καὶ νὰ πλατύνῃ ὁ τόπος,
 “ἐνταῦτα ὅς ἀπερχώμεθα ἐκεῖ εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους τόπους.” 1765
- Οὕτως ὡς τὸ ἐσυμβούλεψεν μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲς ἐκεῖνος,
 (τὸ ἔστερξεν τοῦ νὰ γενῇ) ἀτός του ὁ Καμπανέσης.
 ὦρισεν κ'ἐλαλήσασιν ὅλα τους τὰ σαλπίγγια,
 κ'εὐθέως ἐκαβαλλίκεψαν, ἐκίνησαν κ'ὑπάγουν·
 στὴν Ἀρκαδίαν ἐσώσασιν ὦραν μεσημερίου· 1770
 ἐπιάσαν τὲς κατοῦνες τους, στὸν κάμπον ἐτεντῶσαν,
 (τὸ κάστρον ἐζητήσασιν,) κ'ἐκεῖνοι οὐδὲν τὸ δίδουν,
 διατὶ τὸ κάστρον κοίτεται (ἀπάνω γὰρ στὸ σπήλαιον)
 κ'εἶχαν καὶ πύργον δυνατὸν ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων·
 σωτάρχειον εἶχαν δυνατὴν, ἡλπίζαν νὰ βαστάξουν 1775
 τὴν μάχην καὶ τὸν πόλεμον, νὰ μὴ παραδοθοῦσιν.
 Ἡ μέρα ἐκείνη ἐπέρασεν, ἡ ἄλλη ἐξημερώνει·

1751β = 9 other examples (Table II, p. 180).

1753β = 2462β.

1755β See 1716β.

1756β See 1707β.

1757α = εἶπαν κ'ἐσυμβουλέψασιν 208α; εἶπαν κ'ἐσυμβουλέψαν 2576β, 8667β.

1761β = 1524β.

1766β See 1707β.

1767α = (ὅτι ἔστερξεν τοῦ νὰ γενῇ 8572α).

1767β = <καὶ> ἀτός του ὁ Καμπανέσης 1842β.

1768α = 5450α; = ὦρισεν ἐλαλήσασιν 1136α; ὦρισε νὰ λαλήσουσιν 9034α.

1768β = ὅλα μας τὰ σαλπίγγια 9034β.

1769α = εὐθέως ἐκαβαλλίκεψαν 4764α; εὐθέως ἐκαβαλλίκεψε 6572α; εὐθέως ἐκαβαλλίκεψεν 6568α, 6619α, 8618α.

1769β = 9019β, 9051β; = (ἐκίνησαν κ'ὑπαγαίνουν 8988β).

1770α = στὴν Ἀρκαδίαν ἐσώσεν 1679β.

1770β = ὦρα μεσημερίου 4804β.

1771α = ἐπιάσαν τὲς κατοῦνες 1458β; κ'ἐπιάσαν τὲς κατοῦνες 4201β, 9205β.

1772α = (τὸ κάστρον νὰ ζητήσουν 8389β).

1773β = (ἀπάνω εἰς τὸ σπήλαιον 5436β).

1776β = νὰ μὴ παραδοθοῦσι 2054β.

1777β = κι ἄλλη ἐξημερώνει 2499β.

- ὁ Καμπανέσης ὥρισεν, τὰ τριπουτσέτα ἐστῆσαν
καὶ ἄρχισαν νὰ πολεμοῦν ἐκεῖ ἀπάνω εἰς τὸ κάστρον.
Ἐκ τὸ ἓνα μέρος ἔδερναν μετὰ τῶν τριπουτσέτων, 1780
κι ἀπὸ τὴν ῥάχην κ'ἐμπροσθεν ἦσαν οἱ τζαγρατόροι.
Κι ὡς εἶδασιν οἱ Ἀρκαδινοὶ ὅπου ἦσαν εἰς τὸ κάστρον,
τὸν πόλεμον τὸν δυνατὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἔμπορουν βασιτάζει,
στριγγὴν φωνὴν ἐλάλησαν, ὁ πόλεμος νὰ πάψη.
συμβίβασιν ἐποιήσασιν τὸ κάστρον νὰ παραδώσουν· 1785
κ'εὐθέως ὁ πρωτοστράτορας μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲς ἐκεῖνος
ὥρισεν τῶν ἀρχηγῶν (τὸν πόλεμον νὰ πάψουν.)
Οἱ Ἀρκαδινοὶ ἐζητήσασιν συμπάθειον νὰ τοὺς ποιήσῃ,
ἀφροντισίαν νὰ ἔχουσιν μὲ τὰ ὑποστατικά τους· 1790
ὄρκον ἐδώκασιν εὐτὺς κ'ἐδώκασιν τὸ κάστρον.
Κι ἀφότου ἐπαράλαβεν τὸ κάστρο ὁ Καμπανέσης,
οὐδὲν ἀργήσασιν ἐκεῖ (μόνι καὶ δύο ἡμέρας·)
κι οὕτως ἐσώσασιν ἐκεῖ ὀκάποι ἀποκρισάροι·
πιττάκια ἐβασταίνασιν, ἐκ τὴν Φραγκίαν τὰ ἡφέρναν,
τοῦ Καμπανέση τὰ ἔδωκαν κ'ἐπροσκυνήσανέ τον· 1795
ἐκ στόματος τοὺς ἐρωτᾷ· ("λέγετε τὰ μαντᾶτα.")
Κ'ἐκεῖνοι ὡς ἦσαν λυπηροὶ μετὰ δακρύων τοῦ λέγουν·
"Ἀφέντη μας, ἐγνώριζε, ἀπέθανε ὁ ἀδελφός σου,
"ὅπου ἦτον πρῶτος ἀδελφός, ὁ κόντος τῆς Τσαμπάνιας.
"Οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ τόπου σου, ὅλοι οἱ φλαμουριάροι, ... 1800

- 1778α See 1742α.
1778β = τὰ τριπουτσέτα ἐστήσασιν 852α, 1412α, 1700α, 2057α.
1779α = καὶ ἄρξετον νὰ πολεμῇ 4027α; = (ἀρχάσασιν νὰ πολεμοῦν 3146α).
1779β = 1489β.
1782β See 1702β.
1784α = 1014α; = στριγγὴν φωνὴν ἐλάλησεν 4379α, 5439α.
1784β See 1708β.
1785α = συμβίβασιν ἐποίκασιν 7247α.
1785β = τὸ κάστρον ἐπαρεδῶκαν 1417β; τὸ κάστρο ἐπαρεδῶκαν 2047β; τὸ κάστρον
ἐπαράδωκεν 2855α.
1786β See 1707β.
1787β See 1708β.
1788β See 1704β.
1790β = 2821β, 2870β; = (καὶ ἔδωκεν τὸ κάστρον 8453β).
1791α = 1239α, 2875α, 2956α, 6350α, 8653α; = κι ἀφότου ἐπαράλαβε 2763α; κι
ἀφότου ἐπαράλαβαν 2860α.
1792β = (μόνον καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν 3629β).
1793α cf. κι ὅταν ἐσώσασιν ἐκεῖ 5211α.
1794α = πιττάκια τοῦ ἐβασταίνασιν 6347α.
1795α = 1840α.
1795β = 6346β; = κ'ἐπροσκυνούσανέ τον 2963β.
1796β = (λέγει του τὰ μαντᾶτα 9031β).
1798β = κι ἀπέθανε ὁ ἀδελφός μου 1853β.
1799α = 1193α.
1799β = 16 other examples (Table II, p. 179).
1800β = κι ὅλοι οἱ φλαμουριάροι 3169β; κι ὅλοι του οἱ φλαμουριάροι 4419β.

This sample of 100 lines, with clear evidence that it is of average quality, gives a good illustration of the kinds of formulaic repetition found. But even this length of sample gives results of varying quality, when seen against an analysis of the whole poem. As will be seen from Tables IV and V, the results for arbitrary groups of 100 lines range from 21.2 percent to 53.5 percent for the *Chronicle*, and 5.5 percent to 22.0 percent for *Alexander*. It is comforting that the odds are overwhelmingly against the random discovery in *Alexander* of a passage more repetitious than a random *Chronicle* sample. Only one 100-line sample from *Alexander* is more repetitious than the least formulaic passage from the *Chronicle*. In this respect, 100-line samples are much superior to those of 15 lines. There is a high probability that analysis on this scale will show a clear difference between these two poems. But what is satisfactory here may well not serve in other cases. As I shall explain, there is a greater difference between the results for these two poems than is generally found in the study of formulaic literatures. If fine distinctions are to be made, a 100-line sample is not enough. I would suggest two ways of improving the technique without further increase in the size of the sample. First, one can divide the 100 lines into several small samples, chosen to test different parts of the poem. This division is especially useful if the poem is uneven in style, or if there are any parts which have been regarded as additions to the original text. Second, the underlined sample or samples may be accompanied by a study of the most common formulas to be found in the text, like those listed in Tables I and II. This combination seems to me likely to provide a much more accurate mathematical basis for the prediction of formula totals than any underlined sample on its own. However, there is need for a study of this subject by a statistician.

Finally, I wish to provide tables of statistical data for the whole of both poems. In Tables IV and V each line of figures gives the details for 100 lines of printed text, for which a reference is given in the first column to the editions of Schmitt and Reichmann. To take account of lacunas and inserted lines, the second column then presents the number of half-lines actually found, less than 200 when there is a lacuna, more than 200 when lines have been inserted outside the regular numeration. Then come two percentages; the first only of half-lines which unquestionably come within the definition of formulaic repetition, the second also including those where I consider that doubt is possible. In terms of Table III, the first percentage refers to the phrases underlined but not bracketed, the second to all underlined phrases, bracketed or not.

The contrast between the results presented in these two tables is the chief evidence for the conclusions of this study. In both categories of repetition used, the percentages for the *Chronicle* are three times as great as those for *Alexander*: 31.7 percent to 9.4 percent for certain repetitions, and 38.4 percent to 12.8 percent for repetition which convinces me. This is a ratio of undoubted statistical significance, unambiguous proof of a great difference in means of expression between the two poems, and so of differences between the circumstances of composition. But the scale of the difference must be evaluated fur-

TABLE IV

Formulas in the Alexander

A = Reference to Reichmann's Edition C = Certain Repetitions (%)
B = Number of Half-lines Found D = Repetitions which Convince the Author (%)

A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
1- 100	200	8.0	10.5	2101-2200	200	10.5	16.5	4201-4300	200	4.5	8.5
101- 200	200	10.0	14.0	2201-2300	200	5.5	10.0	4301-4400	200	4.0	6.0
201- 300	200	6.5	10.5	2301-2400	200	4.0	5.5	4401-4500	200	6.5	8.0
301- 400	200	6.5	8.5	2401-2500	200	12.5	15.5	4501-4600	204	12.8	16.2
401- 500	200	10.0	11.5	2501-2600	200	12.0	13.5	4601-4700	202	11.9	16.8
501- 600	200	5.5	7.5	2601-2700	200	11.0	15.0	4701-4800	200	11.0	12.0
601- 700	200	9.5	11.5	2701-2800	200	10.0	13.0	4801-4900	202	5.9	7.4
701- 800	204	5.9	9.3	2801-2900	200	9.5	13.0	4901-5000	200	6.5	12.0
801- 900	200	8.0	11.0	2901-3000	200	10.0	15.0	5001-5100	200	12.0	15.0
901-1000	200	11.5	14.5	3001-3100	200	11.0	17.0	5101-5200	200	12.5	20.0
1001-1100	200	10.0	12.5	3101-3200	200	15.5	19.0	5201-5300	200	10.0	14.0
1101-1200	200	8.5	11.0	3201-3300	200	12.5	19.5	5301-5400	200	6.0	10.5
1201-1300	202	9.4	12.4	3301-3400	200	11.0	14.0	5401-5500	200	17.5	19.5
1301-1400	202	3.5	7.4	3401-3500	200	11.5	15.0	5501-5600	206	7.3	12.1
1401-1500	200	11.5	15.0	3501-3600	200	11.5	15.5	5601-5700	200	5.5	6.5
1501-1600	202	17.3	18.8	3601-3700	200	5.5	8.5	5701-5800	200	7.0	10.0
1601-1700	200	14.0	16.0	3701-3800	200	6.5	9.5	5801-5900	200	8.5	10.5
1701-1800	200	12.5	15.0	3801-3900	200	7.0	12.5	5901-6000	200	4.0	8.0
1801-1900	200	18.5	22.0	3901-4000	200	7.5	11.5	6001-6100	202	7.4	10.4
1901-2000	200	11.5	13.5	4001-4100	200	12.5	17.5	6101-6200	40	12.5	20.0
2001-2100	198	7.0	13.1	4101-4200	200	7.0	11.0				

A B C D

Overall totals: 1-6120 12264 9.4 12.8

ther by examining other literatures where similar contrasts in frequency of repetition have been found.

Studies which depend on the contrast between formulaic and non-formulaic material are remarkably few, considering the large volume of formula counting which has been done. Usually the formulaic nature of a poem is considered to be sufficiently supported by one statistic alone, the estimated percentage of its own formulas. Among those who have analyzed non-formulaic poems, M. Parry relied on a qualitative argument, by showing that their dominant proper names are not involved in formula systems.⁴⁶ A. B. Lord, who has reported on the work of a Harvard seminar in which many different mediaeval literatures have been studied,⁴⁷ is dependent on the sample sizes adopted by those who read papers there. Analyses of considerable weight and value are mixed with others which seem to be only preliminary essays at their respective subjects. But neither there nor in his own more concentrated work on Yugoslav poems has he published evidence of a contrast as great as that between these two early Demotic poems. The best comparative material is J. J. Duggan's study

⁴⁶ *L'Épithète*, 24-36.

⁴⁷ "Homer as Oral Poet" (see note 16 *supra*), 20-21.

TABLE V

Formulas in the Chronicle of the Morea

A = Reference to Schmitt's Edition

C = Certain Repetitions (%)

B = Number of Half-lines Found

D = Repetitions which Convince the Author (%)

A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
1- 100	0	0	0	3101-3200	200	33.5	43.0	6201-6300	196	28.6	35.7
101- 200	192	32.3	38.5	3201-3300	200	38.5	45.0	6301-6400	198	41.9	50.0
201- 300	200	36.5	40.5	3301-3400	200	33.5	40.0	6401-6500	198	38.9	45.4
301- 400	200	37.0	44.0	3401-3500	200	36.5	44.0	6501-6600	188	35.1	46.8
401- 500	200	35.5	45.0	3501-3600	200	36.5	45.0	6601-6700	200	41.5	49.0
501- 600	200	30.5	39.0	3601-3700	200	29.0	38.0	6701-6800	194	41.2	49.0
601- 700	200	26.0	32.5	3701-3800	198	13.6	21.2	6801-6900	200	39.5	48.5
701- 800	200	26.0	34.0	3801-3900	198	28.3	35.4	6901-7000	198	22.7	28.3
801- 900	200	22.5	30.5	3901-4000	200	26.5	35.5	7001-7100	200	27.5	34.5
901-1000	200	32.5	35.5	4001-4100	200	29.0	33.5	7101-7200	200	37.0	46.0
1001-1100	200	30.5	37.5	4101-4200	198	22.2	28.8	7201-7300	200	31.5	35.5
1101-1200	200	35.5	42.0	4201-4300	200	26.0	34.5	7301-7400	198	37.9	44.9
1201-1300	196	40.8	44.4	4301-4400	200	35.5	42.5	7401-7500	200	34.0	40.5
1301-1400	200	21.0	27.0	4401-4500	190	30.0	38.9	7501-7600	200	28.0	38.0
1401-1500	200	38.5	41.0	4501-4600	128	42.2	46.9	7601-7700	200	25.0	31.5
1501-1600	200	34.5	43.0	4601-4700	198	34.8	40.9	7701-7800	200	29.0	34.0
1601-1700	200	30.5	36.0	4701-4800	200	22.0	26.5	7801-7900	184	35.9	42.9
1701-1800	200	33.5	38.5	4801-4900	158	34.8	38.0	7901-8000	200	38.0	46.0
1801-1900	198	36.9	44.4	4901-5000	200	22.5	28.5	8001-8100	198	26.8	28.8
1901-2000	200	23.0	27.5	5001-5100	200	26.5	31.5	8101-8200	200	41.5	46.5
2001-2100	200	32.5	38.0	5101-5200	200	24.0	29.0	8201-8300	200	18.5	24.5
2101-2200	199	29.1	37.7	5201-5300	188	34.6	42.0	8301-8400	200	30.0	34.5
2201-2300	196	27.6	35.7	5301-5400	126	20.6	31.8	8401-8500	188	32.4	40.4
2301-2400	198	39.4	46.0	5401-5500	196	29.6	37.8	8501-8600	200	22.5	29.0
2401-2500	198	31.3	36.4	5501-5600	186	28.0	34.9	8601-8700	200	29.5	37.0
2501-2600	200	36.5	41.5	5601-5700	130	37.7	42.3	8701-8800	200	31.0	39.5
2601-2700	200	32.5	39.5	5701-5800	200	38.0	43.5	8801-8900	198	47.0	53.5
2701-2800	200	30.0	38.0	5801-5900	200	29.5	38.0	8901-9000	198	33.4	40.4
2801-2900	198	31.8	35.9	5901-6000	194	34.5	39.7	9001-9100	198	30.8	37.4
2901-3000	200	39.5	43.0	6001-6100	198	25.3	30.3	9101-9200	200	36.0	40.5
3001-3100	202	32.1	40.1	6101-6200	194	29.9	37.6	9201-9300	70	25.7	30.0

A B C D

Overall totals: 1-9235 17861 31.7 38.4

of a group of French *chansons de geste* and romances.⁴⁸ It is possible to make direct comparisons between his work and the conclusions of the present study, for this has been strongly influenced by the methods and standards adopted by Duggan. His most repetitious poem, the *Couronnement de Louis*, analyzed in full, has a formulaic percentage of 37 percent compared with 16 percent for the *Enéas*, the least repetitious romance. This is a smaller contrast than that found here. To pass from the evidence of the contrast to that of the *Chronicle*'s formulaic percentage in itself; it too compares well with what may be found elsewhere. Lord, in his Yugoslav work, tentatively sets the dividing

⁴⁸ Duggan, "Couronnement."

line between genuine oral-formulaic material and literary imitation at around 25 percent of straight formula.⁴⁹ Duggan, the only other scholar I know to have attempted such a division, proposes a lower limit of 20 percent in French,⁵⁰ but his working definition of the formula may be a little more exclusive than Lord's. The standards of the present analysis have more in common with those of Duggan than those of Lord. Thus, if there is any value at all in such comparative evidence, the *Chronicle of the Morea* is an extremely formulaic poem. None of the 100-line samples in Table V fall below Duggan's standard, and only two below Lord's. Most of the poem is far above these levels, so far that one is tempted to waive the caution which must be employed in making comparisons between different linguistic traditions.

The rest of this paper will be an attempt to draw conclusions from the proof of the formulaic nature of the *Chronicle of the Morea*: taking the sketch I have presented of current attitudes to formulaic studies, to apply its results to this poem, and to extend them provisionally to the whole field of early Demotic Greek.

The first attempt to be made is the rehabilitation of this poem as a work of Greek literature. Most of those who have recently expressed opinions about it have called it a piece of translationese, poorly adapted from an original in French or Italian. A major justification for this is the style of the poem: "Repeatedly the author uses the same word two or three times in a sentence, where the natural tendency would be to find a synonym. This is especially apparent in his attempt to maintain the poetic meter of the work. Whole phrases are repeated, sentences are inverted, unnecessary words are inserted, all to fill out the lines. These characteristics certainly betray a translation or adaptation rather than an original piece of writing."⁵¹ "Questa impressione (della traduzione), invece, si ricava proprio dalla lettura del testo greco, che è quasi sempre prolisso e scialbo, e raramente innalza lo stile."⁵² "Les innombrables appositions, répétitions, insertions de mots supplémentaires et souvent inutiles. . . ."⁵³ In view of the proof given above of the formulaic nature of this poem, it seems to me that these observations are not evidence for the theory that it was a translation. Much of this comment could be made about any formulaic poem, and all of it is applicable to a mediocre formulaic poem. These critics have noticed that repetition is a major characteristic of the style of the *Chronicle*, but they have ascribed it to an inadequate grasp of the Greek language, not to a formulaic style of composition. Perhaps they were judging it as a work of history, rather than as the national epic of the Moreot principality.

⁴⁹ Lord, "Homer as Oral Poet," 20-21.

⁵⁰ "Couronnement," 343-44. This distinction has now been made with greater precision in Duggan's, *The Song of Roland. Formulaic Style and Poetic Craft* (Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1973), 29-30. This is a thorough examination of a parallel subject, much more comprehensive than the present study. Though some of my preconceptions and conclusions differ from those of Duggan, his practical methodology remains the only defensible approach to the analysis of formulas.

⁵¹ Lurier, *Crusaders as Conquerors*, 42.

⁵² Spadaro, "Studi introduttivi alla *Cronaca di Morea* III," 67.

⁵³ Jacoby, "Quelques considérations sur les versions de la *Chronique de Morée*," 152.

The repetitious form of expression is quite in place in the epic frame of reference: this poem is viable as an original Greek work. As a national epic, it suffers from the great disadvantage that the people which it celebrates, the Moreot Franks, lost their independent existence soon after its composition. Had they survived longer, the *Chronicle* would have been a source of national pride, like the Homeric poems, *Roland* and the *Cid*. The *Chronicle* must be regarded as an inferior example of this genre, but it should be classified within it.

If this poem is a mediocre though original epic, rather than a poorly translated work of history, what advice may be given to the historians who use it? Fortunately there is no problem over the major events portrayed, for they are often obviously inaccurate, and usually better described in some other source.⁵⁴ It is an accepted fact that the poet must have used oral sources; in fact there is direct confirmation of this in the text.⁵⁵ On matters of detail, however, especially the background of events—the feudal structure of the Principality of the Morea—the poet speaks with an easy certainty which is most impressive, especially when the information he gives cannot be checked in any other source. There is no objection in principle to accepting this evidence as readily from a formulaic poem as from a non-formulaic poem; but there are two important practical provisos. First, a poet who works from oral sources may preserve valuable information from the past, but he is just as likely to be reflecting the situation in his own day. Though the Homeric poems, for example, preserve accurately the bronze accoutrements of the Mycenaean age in which the Trojan war is set, they still make occasional use of iron.⁵⁶ It would be surprising if the *Chronicle* were any more accurate than this. Second, little reliance is to be placed in the use of individual words and phrases. It is likely in each case that a formula is being used unthinkingly rather than that a new word group is being composed with special reference to the situation in hand. David Jacoby, without making any use of the theories of oral composition, has employed both these provisos against Ostrogorsky's use of the *Chronicle* in his analysis of feudalism.⁵⁷ In studying the extent of the *pronoia* system in the early thirteenth century, Ostrogorsky examines the details of the terms of submission by which the different communities of the Morea surrendered to the Frankish conquerors after 1204.⁵⁸ Jacoby suggests that the terms are probably described from the standpoint of the fourteenth century, when the account was composed. He demonstrates that the poet of the *Chronicle* shows a certain

⁵⁴ See the lists of confusions in the early part of the French work, paralleled in the Greek, given by J. Longnon, *Chronique de Morée* (Paris, 1911), XXXIV–XL.

⁵⁵ 1354–55: ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀφήγησες ἐκείνων τῶν παλαιῶν, ὅπου ἦλθασιν μετὰ ἐκείνων, ἐπρόκοψαν μεγάλας.

The author hopes to pass on these oral stories from the old conquerors, and so to benefit his listeners.

⁵⁶ This is not usually in the form of a clear anachronism: more often iron is used for valuable ritual objects, like the axes through which Penelope's suitors must shoot. Also common is the metaphorical use: σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός X 357, ψ 172; σιδήρειόν νύ τοι ἦτορ Ω 205, 521. But it is sometimes used for common weapons, e.g., ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος π 294, τ 13; πέλασεν τόξω σίδηρον Δ 123.

⁵⁷ D. Jacoby, "Les archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque," *Travaux et Mémoires*, 2 (1967), 421–81.

⁵⁸ G. Ostrogorsky, *Pour l'Histoire de la Féodalité Byzantine* (Brussels, 1954), 55–61.

lack of rigor in the use of feudal terminology. The formulaic proof can give theoretical support to Jacoby's practical arguments.⁵⁹

Probably the most interesting development from the proof of formulaic composition will come in the sphere of language. The *Chronicle*, like most of the early Demotic texts, contains a surprising mixture of linguistic forms. It is in fact an extreme example, with classical forms, mediaeval forms, and their vulgar modern equivalents jostling for position in neighboring lines—even, sometimes, in the same line.⁶⁰ This mixture of forms was frequently the *casus belli* in the bitter scholarly campaign between Psichari and Chatzidakis over the literary respectability of the Greek δημοτική.⁶¹ Psichari thought that the language developed through a long stage of morphological confusion, accurately reflected in texts like the *Chronicle*, which would thus be composed in the spoken language of their day. Chatzidakis disagreed. He believed that these early Demotic texts arose from the fact that writers in the δημοτική had no vernacular precedents on which to base their orthography. Since they had learned to read and write, they must have learned elements of the ancient orthography and grammar. Therefore, in trying to write their spoken language, they found themselves intermittently hindered by the written forms they had learned. Recently a third explanation has been put forward by H.-G. Beck,⁶² that these poems are not popular works at all, but informal experiments by some of the *litterati* when they relaxed the rigid linguistic censorship of Byzantine education. This view would explain much that is puzzling in the texts and also the courtly connections and aristocratic attitudes which most of them seem to share. However, I should like to suggest a different reason, based on the formulaic quality of the text, for linguistic confusion in the *Chronicle*. Homer, too, used a mixture of languages, which, as Milman Parry showed, originated in the complexity of the hexameter and the needs of a centuries-old tradition of oral poets.⁶³ I believe that it will be possible to prove a similar origin for the language of the *Chronicle*—and probably for that of other early Demotic poems—using the demands of the political line and of a tradition of Demotic oral poets. Such proof, if it can be established, together with proof of the formulaic nature of the poem, will forge a formidable tool for the analysis

⁵⁹ Jacoby's argument seems to me to survive unscathed from Ostrogorsky's brief reply, "Die Pronoia unter den Komnenen," *Zbornik radova vizantološkog instituta*, 12 (1970–71), 52–3. Ostrogorsky assumes that the *Chronicle's* details about the terms of capitulation come from documentary evidence surviving from the date of conquest. If he is right, then the argument is at an end. But there is no support for this view in the text, except for the author's confident use of technical language. Ostrogorsky also finds it unthinkable that the name *pronoia* should spread to the Morea during the period of Frankish power. I find no difficulty in this—but we are straying beyond the scope of the present study. I have no positive insights to report, merely the confirmation that the evidence provided by the *Chronicle* is not reliable.

⁶⁰ E.g., 6300: πολλάκις μὴ τὸ ἐδέξατο κι οὐ μὴ τὸ ἐκαταδέχτη.

⁶¹ The most complete statements of the respective cases may be found in J. Psichari, *Essais de Grammaire Historique Néogrecque*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886, 1889); G. N. Chatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1892).

⁶² H.-G. Beck, "Die griechische Volksliteratur des 14 Jahrhunderts. Beiträge zu einer Standortbestimmung," *XIV^e Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines, Bucharest (1971), Rapports I*, 67–81; *Volksliteratur*, 1–11.

⁶³ *Les Formules* (see note 7 *supra*); *idem*, "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making (see note 8 *supra*), 1–50.

of this kind of literature. It should then be possible to make considerable strides, both in the sociology of its literary creation and in the history of the δημοτική.

Textual criticism in the *Chronicle*, as it happens, is not a difficult problem.⁶⁴ This text is unusual in possessing a clear *codex optimus*, the Copenhagen manuscript (H). But when one examines the relation of H to the later manuscripts, the same divergences appear which have caused serious and sometimes insuperable difficulties to the editors of other texts.⁶⁵ The differences are nearly all points of detail, for there is almost line-by-line correspondence between the manuscripts in Schmitt's edition. This precludes the possibility that the variants arise from living oral versions. Memorization is a possible explanation, but less likely, I think, than corruption within a scribal framework. But, as I have speculated before, the scribes themselves act in some sense as parts of the re-creative oral tradition. They seem to read a few lines and then write them in much the same words but with constant minor differences.⁶⁶ These range from the change of an ending, or the insertion or omission of a conjunction, to the replacement of a complete half-line by another. The conception of the scribe's task in copying a vernacular text differs altogether from that in copying a classical author. In the former case, in fact, the idea of the exact copy has not yet been formulated. The scribe is dealing here with his own everyday level of the Greek language, in the meter appropriate to a fluid oral song. For such a song, the idea of verbatim oral repetition has yet to be established, and so the written text also is remade at each copying. Such an argument will explain the textual complications of most of the early Demotic poems. In *Digenis Akritas*, *Libistros and Rhodamne*, and the *Achilleis*, however, there are more serious problems where different versions of the same texts have been developed. If any, or all, of these poems proves to be formulaic, it will be interesting to discover in each case whether the differences seem to have been made orally or in writing. Whatever the scale of the variation, the proof of formulaic composition will be of assistance to the editor. It will provide him with a rationale for changes in his text far greater and more numerous than those which could be expected otherwise. It will give him a rough basis for deciding between major variants, for the phrases imported by the scribe are likely to be clichés to him—formulas either in the poems which he copies or in those which he hears. In the last resort, a formulaic proof will give theoretical justification for printing a divided text.

The statement of conclusions is moving from the *Chronicle* itself to other poems in early Demotic Greek. In fact, I hope that the proof of formulas in

⁶⁴ J. Schmitt, *Die Chronik von Morea. Eine Untersuchung über das Verhältnis ihrer Handschriften und Versionen* (Inaugural-Dissertation) (Munich, 1889), 76–96.

⁶⁵ See the remarks of Wartenberg, "Die byzantinische *Achilleis*" (see note 2 *supra*), 173–201; J. A. Lambert, *Le Roman de Libistros et Rhodamné* (Amsterdam, 1935), 50; E. Trapp, *Digenis Akritas. Synoptische Ausgabe der ältesten Versionen* (Wiener byzantinische Studien VIII) (Vienna 1971), 13–48.

⁶⁶ See the brief example given in Jeffreys, "*Imberios and Margarona*," 153–55 (see note 2 *supra*). Further evidence may be found in the apparatus criticus of any early Demotic work which survives in more than one manuscript, and in H.-G. Beck, "Überlieferungsgeschichte der byzantinischen Literatur," in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung*, I (Zurich, 1961), 470–93.

one poem of this period and at this linguistic level will lead to similar research in others. If the conclusions of this study are accepted, and the *Chronicle* is proved a formulaic poem, it will become easy to extend the proof and to demonstrate how wide the influence of oral tradition has been. It will no longer be necessary to complete a full formulaic examination of the poems to be tested. I would recommend a series of samples, including every subdivision of the poem and making up a total of at least a hundred lines—more, if it is discovered that the different samples give widely varying results. As many as possible of the samples should be printed in full, and complete statistical details given for all of them.⁶⁷ This analysis method should be supplemented by a table listing all the most common formulas in the whole work. The present study has sketched broad guidelines on interpretation of the results. These criteria will become more complete and more subtle as the work continues. I think that the establishment of the formulaic level of an early Demotic work ought to become a recognized part of the making of an edition, for the results of such an analysis will have a strong impact on all those who think about a poem, not least its editor. I hope that this preliminary study will make the investigation both easier and more systematic.

The problem does not end there however, for mere proof of formulaic status gives us little concrete information about the poem concerned. Almost nothing concrete has been learned here of the *Chronicle of the Morea*, although I hope that a solid foundation has been laid for the study of its problems. Once the formulaic proof has been made several further lines of thought open up, as I have attempted to show in these last few pages. Information derived from these must be combined with any special circumstances connected with the poem: in the case of the *Chronicle*, for example, one must remember the versions in other languages, and also the existence in the text of several passages which suggest a break in the narrative,⁶⁸ as when a performer pauses for relaxation and refreshment before continuing with his task. There will also be negative results to be included in the judgment: the formulas of the *Chronicle* are weak and banal compared with the vivid phrases of Homer, and seem to have preserved little from the past. Further, there is no sign of themes, the larger-scale units of organization in the narrative, like the assembly scenes and the arming of heroes, which are important features of other formulaic poems.⁶⁹ On such data it should be possible to reach judgments about this poem much more comprehensive and more certain than is possible at present. By repeating the process with several poems, we shall come to a better understanding of a whole area of literature.

⁶⁷ See pp. 173–75 *supra* for remarks on the standards to be maintained in the search for formulas and the tabulation of results.

⁶⁸ Particularly pairs of phrases like 3043–45:

Ἐν τούτῳ θέλω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν νὰ πᾶρω καὶ νὰ λέγω . . .
καὶ θέλω νὰ σὲ ἀφηγηθῶ περὶ . . .

Similar pairs may be found at 1333–36, 3464–66, 4678–80, 5922–24, 6520–22, 6813–17, 7301–3, 7955–61, 8474–76.

⁶⁹ Lord, *Singer*, 68–98; Baugh, "Improvisation in the Middle English Romance" (see note 27 *supra*), 440–54.